Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Editorial Office 1323 M STREET, WASHINGTON 5, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066
VOL. V, NO. 27, *Issue Number* 232, JULY 7, 1948 ★ *Editors:* FELIX MORLEY & FRANK C. HANIGHEN

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA ACCEPTED JUL 12 1948 LIBRARY

CHRISTIANITY AND PLANNED ECONOMY

by Frank Chodorov

There must be a quality in Christianity which the non-Christian, untutored in esoteric interpretations of the Gospel, cannot grasp. Or so it seems to me, when I measure the preachments of many of its current professors with what I have always considered the yardstick of Christianity -- the life and teachings of Jesus Christ. But, then, I know nothing of Christianity except what I have learned from the Gospels. So it may be that the present exegesis will strike trained theologians as an amateurish over-simplification.

I refer to the enthusiasm of a considerable segment of the ministry for the doctrine of human improvement by means of political formulae, more particularly those of the Socialistic genre. From the pulpit come utterances that seem to identify the brotherhood of man with the police-State; the Kingdom of Heaven with the Leviathan of Hobbes.

On what testamentary evidence? For the life of me I cannot locate in Scripture any support for socialized medicine, make-work programs or the nationalization of industry. Neither the Charter of the United Nations nor the Communist Manifesto bear resemblance to anything taught by Jesus. And yet, His vicars -- which the ministers claim to be -- often plug for these things, and apparently in His name.

My understanding of His teachings leads me to believe that Jesus put full responsibility for personal behavior upon the individual. He suggested no way of transferring that responsibility. He did not say that man could shift his obligation as the image of God to some governmental agency. Not one word do I find in the Gospels hinting that human souls can be merged into a super-colossal collectivized soul. According to this source-book, salvation cannot come to man via a politico-economic system, nor does it put down as moral behavior mere conformance to any such system.

Jesus stressed the dignity of the individual and the glory of God. I take it that these two precepts are the premises of Christianity -- if Christ is Christianity.

Copyright 1948 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is no State in His cosmos. He did say that He came to fulfill the law, not to break it. But from His attacks on established institutions it seems clear that the law referred to was not the "commandments of men". It was something higher than the edicts of a politburo. By what word, or act, does Christ identify His law with the wisdom of the planner or the say-so of the bureaucrat?

When Jesus walked and talked with men, the nearest thing to a bureaucracy was the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Rome concerned itself with the collection of tribute, and if this came regularly and in sufficient quantity, the people were suffered to carry on their social affairs in their accustomed way. The traditional theocracy served Rome as an instrument of "law and order", and managed affairs effectively through its influence as interpreter of tribal law and customs. Only when police power had to be invoked did Rome intervene. Up to that point, the dicta of the priesthood -- as promulgated by the scribes and the Pharisees -- had the force of bureaucratic directives.

Christ's opinion of these contemporary bureaucrats was too often and too clearly expressed to leave any doubt about it. May we not assume that, as a general principle, He would put little weight on the doctrine of social or individual improvement through official guidance? Would He, in these days, endow with righteousness the Pharisees of Socialism? Or the scribes who would substitute political and economic planning for the exercise of free will?

There is something incongruous in the advocacy of modern Phariseeism on the part of many ministers. It does not seem Christian. It is a sort of paganism, in that it deposes God in favor of the State, and substitutes for human dignity an idol called "social good".

How, in the name of common sense, can Jesus be enrolled on the side of a dole system, which, in the final analysis, is the necessary concomitant of a controlled economy? How can wardship under the State be associated with His name? True, He made much of charity, but He insisted that "thine alms be secret", and what is there secret about standing in line at the unemployment insurance office?

Charity is, and can only be, a personal matter -- as to giver and receiver. It is not charity when the recipient lays claim to aid by law and an application blank, and the giver is a reluctant and impersonal "public". The State cannot be charitable for it has nothing to give, except that which it has taken from producers by compulsion. That is to say, the State gives taxes. And taxation is referred to in the Gospels

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as "tribute", while the tax-collector is designated as a person of low degree. Hence, the attempt to identify the public dole with the Christ-concept of charity is attenuated, if not actually blasphemous.

III

In view of Christ's obvious antipathy toward "tribute", it seems to me that not only the dole, but every activity of the State, is discredited by Christianity. The State lives by and for the collection of taxes; without taxes it would not be; without taxes it could not carry on the Socialist ventures which some professing Christians strangely advocate. If the institution of taxation is an evil, as Scripture indicates, then all that follows from this evil is also evil. The Socialistic ventures are made immoral by this original immorality.

"A good man out of the treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things", said Jesus. He did not say a good council, a good synagogue, a good planning board; nor did He mention a good tax. He specified a "good man". It is inconsistent with Christ's teachings to ascribe goodness to impersonal schemes, or to infuse a soul into a collectivity.

Frequent reference is made by ministerial energumens of Statism to the parable of the coin: "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

Significantly enough, the circumstances which elicited this remark are usually ignored by those who use it in support of the political establishment. Jesus was being heckled by enemies, whose obvious intent was to trick Him into making a statement that could be used against Him with the authorities. He had "perceived their wickedness". His enigmatic reply simply confused His confounders, as the Gospels relate, and it can be assumed that this was His purpose.

So the parable is without the philosophic content frequently attributed to it. This was an on-the-spot remark, called forth by special circumstances, and cannot be classed with freely given lessons that obviously came from the heart, such as the Sermon on the Mount.

But, what did Jesus mean? What are the things due Caesar? Are they due as a matter of right or of might? Can one infer from this parable that tribute is included in God's scheme of things? Or, forsooth, did Jesus mean to put Caesar on a par with God? Taken by itself, the parable of the coin can be made to mean even that absurdity. Taken with Christ's teachings as a whole it lacks significance. Seeing how He stressed man's duty to God, the parable might well be rephrased: the more of yourself you render unto Caesar, the less you have for God.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Christ's time was not free from politics. The entrenched ecclesiasts, naturally enough, were strong for the Roman status quo. Then there were a number -- it has never been established how many -- who advocated revolution. These "zealots" asserted that not until the Roman yoke was thrown off, and the Jewish kingdom restored, would the grace of Yahweh come upon the people again. There is not a shred of evidence that Jesus concerned himself with the zealots, or that Roman rule interested Him in the least. As for the ecclesiasts, Christ held them in scorn only because of their perversion of principle.

The "zealots", of course, received short shrift from the Romans when caught. It was therefore to the interest of the high priests, who were annoyed by the popularity of Jesus, and fearful for their prestige if not their prerogatives, to pin the label of "zealot" on Him. The incident of the parable of the coin must be related to this fact; so, too, the derogatory title of "King of the Jews". Jesus, by His exemplary behavior and His disconcerting statements, made it difficult to lay the heresy charge against Him. Besides, Pontius Pilate cared not a fig for the religious quarrels of this pestiferous sect. The only way to get rid of Jesus was to involve Him with the revolutionary agitators.

When the high priests brought Jesus to Pontius Pilate for sentence, they had a hard time making this accusation stick. The Roman seems to have been well satisfied that whatever the shortcomings of the defendant, at least He was not a political agitator. Among the modern vicars of Christ are some who are not so sure about that.

Nevertheless, there is nothing in the story of Jesus that in the slightest suggests an affinity with Henry Wallace, Josef Stalin, Clement Attlee or even Franklin Roosevelt. Christ had no high opinion of men who accumulate material wealth. But he did not propose to improve the lot of some by depriving others of their property. He did not promise salvation in a five-year plan, social security or compulsory military training. Man-made law was not His panacea. He had no ready-made blueprint for decency. He did not endow with divinity either a system or an enforcement agency. He had no truck with self-beatified bureaucracy.

It seems to me -- a non-Christian who has always taken for granted that Christ is Christianity -- that Jesus proclaimed the dignity of the individual and the glory of God, and nothing else. And that, I submit, is not consonant with the doctrine of the supremacy of the State.

Frank Chodorov, an occasional contributor to HUMAN EVENTS, is editor of analysis, published at 150 Nassau Street, New York 7.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to Human Events. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to Human Events, 1323 M Street, N. W., Washington 5, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) and foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip

July 7, 1948

By Frank C. Hanighen

The Democrats surely need consolation these days, and perhaps that is all there is to a revival of discussion, during the past week, about the possibility that the Democrats might win the Senate next November. Nevertheless, some GOP leaders do show some concern about the elections for the Senate, and the statistics are impressive. The fact is that 32 Senate seats will be at stake next November -- 18 Republican, 14 Democratic. Ten of these 14 are in the Solid South where normally the GOP has no chance. That leaves only four Democratic seats outside the South as likely targets for Republican assault. Three of the 18 Republican seats are in border states where Republican victories are normally considered providential; and there's always a chance that local situations may work adversely to other northern Republican incumbents. The line-up in the Senate today is 51 for the Republicans, 45 for the Democrats -- a slim margin. The Democrats need only a net gain of four seats. Thus, if the Democrats held the Solid South, and all four northern Democratic seats, and picked up four more from Republicans, Democratic organization of the Senate would follow. And Democratic control of the Upper Chamber would badly hamper a GOP executive. So, at least, run Democratic hopes.

All this assumes that a GOP victory would fall short of sweep proportions. If Eisenhower is not drafted by the Democrats, a sweep seems in the cards and would undoubtedly remove danger to Republican control of the Senate. A sweep might even cut into the Solid South, in one state, Tennessee. Retiring GOP Chairman Carroll Reece is reportedly considering entrance into the Tennessee Senatorial contest. Normally he would stand no chance for election. But this year an angry feud has riven the Democratic party in Tennessee, and it might result in adding another vote to the Republican score in the U.S. Senate. Be that as it may. It can be said with certainty that the GHQ in Pawling has the Senate situation prominently on its agenda. Not only will candidate Dewey personally aid the campaigns of GOP contenders for the Senate in key contests, but the national organization will also give generous assistance.

* * * * *

Among names mentioned as possibilities for a Dewey cabinet, one recurs rather often -- Mr. Lou Wentz, National Committeeman from Oklahoma. There is good reason for the talk about Mr. Wentz, because he has been a Dewey stalwart for many years. In the last Convention, he held his delegation (with one exception -- a stubborn Taft follower) for the New York Governor from the beginning to the triumphant and sweaty end. Wentz indeed merits a handsome reward. As a Westerner, he might be considered for the Interior post, if it were not for the fact that he is a wealthy oil man. There would be less objection, if he wanted to be Secretary of Commerce.

* * * * *

On July 1, the United States Treasury announced that it had ended the fiscal year with the unprecedented surplus of about $8.4 billions. Quite properly critics hastened to warn that too much optimism is not justified; that the inflationary situation is in large part responsible for the high level of income, the tax receipts and the surplus; and that the 80th Congress did its share toward producing this large surplus figure by some smart bookkeeping. Nevertheless, there is

Copyright 1948 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reason for feeling some encouragement about the Government's budgetary and fiscal situation. The New York Times on July 4 commented: "It now appears fairly definite that there will be no deficit Federal financing in the new fiscal year starting July 1. According to the best financial opinion as the year opened on Thursday, it seems that the high level of national income will be continued, with tax receipts maintained in sufficient volume to cover expenditures."

Also, on July 3, Congressman Harold Knutson (Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and architect of the tax reduction bill) took a rosy view of fiscal conditions in the coming year, stressing an anticipated GOP victory and expectation of continued budget surpluses. He concluded that taxes may be reduced again next year by another $4.5 billions. The Congressman, who recently talked of retiring, now announces that he will run again. It therefore seems likely that this advocate of a liberal tax program will guide tax legislation again in the 81st Congress.

Another reassuring note was struck in Washington recently. The military subcommittee of the Hoover Reorganization Committee met in the nation's capital on June 29 and 30. It is reported that not only the members present, but also chiefs of the Armed Services appearing before the group, seemed keenly aware of the danger to the health of the economy from swelling military expenditures; and showed a determination to find ways of reducing them. It is recalled that the Truman Administration, far from urging economy measures on the Armed Services, encouraged the military leaders to ask for more money. It is a fair assumption that an incoming GOP Administration would take a contrary course and that the Executive and Legislative bodies would work together for long-delayed economy in defense matters. On balance, therefore, any appraisal of the future of the budgetary and fiscal situation should include some positive factors.

* * * * *

The suddenness with which the volcanic conditions in Eastern Europe have produced a new kind of Red vertebrate naturally makes commentators hesitate to venture summary opinions on the Tito affair. But there are two aspects of the situation which might well be pondered. For one thing, it is now apparent that in Yugoslavia Soviet imperialism has found itself over-extended. Theorists for the past two years have speculated as to when and where the Moscow imperium would run thin. Now they know with certainty. The implications of this conclusion are indeed favorable for the future of Italy and France.

A second conclusion is not reassuring. It is presented by experts who not only have extensive knowledge of Kremlin strategy, but also possess a "feel" of the situation, by reason of their former association with the Comintern. They believe that the conflict in the Balkans reflects a conflict in Moscow, in the Politburo. One of these experts paints a picture of the "madmen" (Zhdanov, Malenkov, Beria), now running the show, as being at odds with the "conservatives" -- and the generals. The Soviet military men, according to this view, are inclined to "go slow" and to oppose impetuous moves of the "madmen". It is further emphasized that those who read logical motives behind such moves as the Cominform's excommunication of Tito are on shaky ground; that the Soviet rulers, like Hitler in his decline, are now acting through "hasty improvisation". They could, in a moment of excitement, decide to "shoot the works"; say in Germany. Perhaps a sense of the dangerous illogicality of Kremlin policy today prompts in part the grave concern of the State Department about the Berlin crisis, and the solemn delivery of the Three-Power notes of July 6.

* * * * *

Too much elation has been shown in Washington over the troubles of Soviet Russia, supposedly hampered in its fell designs elsewhere in Europe by the phenomenon of Marshal Tito. It might well be retorted that, with the Berlin crisis at its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

height, the portents of Palestine have not made policy-making for the United States any easier. The State Department and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have plenty to worry about in the Near East.

According to one analysis in Washington, the Holy Land truce has worked to the benefit of Jewish military strength. The extremist Irgun never agreed to the truce provisions, and has been busily amassing arms and manpower. Irgun elements control the New City area of Jerusalem and have succeeded in bolstering its position during the past few weeks. Meanwhile the Arabs have had difficulties in getting arms; and little increase in Arab power has been noted. Also, it has become clearer since the truce that the Egyptian army in the recent fighting played a rather small role which is not likely to grow much larger if fighting is resumed. All things considered, the forces of Israel enjoy a much better position to press for victory if the truce is not extended. If it is prolonged, then Israel will simply accumulate more strength than will the Arabs. Now, if the strengths of the two sides were to remain approximately stable, there might be a chance for a peace settlement. But, obviously, this is not the situation.

Therefore, Washington observers are speculating about the possible effects of an Arab defeat. Those who know Arab lands expect that, in such a case, some of the Arab governments would be overthrown by their disappointed peoples. The governments of Iraq, Lebanon and Syria are mentioned as shaky. It is also recalled that Soviet fifth columns are active in these States. The morrow of an Arab defeat would offer rich opportunities for the agents of the Kremlin.

* * * * *

Buried in financial papers on July 3 was an item which has much more than economic significance. On July 2, the Malayan Government announced the removal of a forty-year-old special duty on unsmelted tin destined for smelters outside the British Empire. This move makes tin ore from Malaya (one of the two great world sources of the mineral) available for the Texas City smelter and should ease the American situation in this strategic material. It also marks the fall of one of the great pillars of British restrictionism which has long hampered world economic development. Government experts on raw materials read political, as well as economic, significance into the event.

Serious Communist disorders in Malaya have for some time threatened the continued output not only of tin, but also of rubber. Experts in Washington say that the export duty on tin ore has provided fertile soil for Communist agitators. There are some 50,000 smalltime operators of tin mines and the duty has imposed a severe handicap on their business, with resultant unemployment among native Chinese who work in these small mines. Removal of the duty seems to be an attempt on the part of British rulers to combat the mounting Communist tide. And, they go on, the Communist action in Malaya is but part of a world-wide attempt by the Comintern to reduce the supply of raw materials to the industry of Western countries, especially of the United States.

In particular, the Comintern strategy is designed to upset the present world-wide oil strategy of the United States. For instance, Comintern agents have been very active in the Palembang area of Sumatra, Dutch East Indies, where American companies have a program of development to restore oil production to pre-war levels by 1950. This restoration is extremely vital, for full production would enable the East Indies to supply sufficient oil for all the Far East. Such a supply would in turn free Near East oil (from Bahrein Island) which is now going to the Far East. According to our oil strategy, the Near East oil would then (provided Near East peace is maintained) serve to meet Europe's needs. And Venezuelan petroleum, now going to Europe, would take care of Western hemisphere shortages. Such are the American plans which the Comintern seeks to upset.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

Freud: His Dream and Sex Theories, by Joseph Jastrow. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, $1.00. Reviewed by J. M. Lalley.

Dr. Jastrow died in 1944. This study, first published about a dozen years earlier, was called The House that Freud Built, a name that affords a better clue to its contents and temper than the title adopted for these popular reprint editions destined for the drugstore trade. Anyway, the book remains probably the clearest exposition available of the psychoanalytic doctrines and methods, apart from Freud's own Introduction to the subject. Dr. Jastrow was not a votary of the cult and what distinguishes his work from that of the Prophet is its critical and somewhat ironic approach.

Its interest and importance lie in the fact that the Freudian revelation, because of the fascination it has exerted upon so many poets, novelists, dramatists and journalists, has been perhaps the greatest single influence on the imaginative climate of our Twentieth Century. It is, among other things, a system of metaphysics which has had notable repercussions in the social and political orders. It accounts in some degree for the anti-rationalist spirit of the age and seems to have given the coup de grace to the roseate dreams of progress and human perfectibility. In this respect the influence of Freud upon contemporary history is comparable to the influence of Rousseau on the earlier half of the Nineteenth Century and to the influence of Darwin on the latter half. Freudianism, as Dr. Jastrow puts it, calls for "an unprecedented form of revolution by way of a reconstructed inner life. . . . The conflict is between the life of impulse and the life of reason."

Psychoanalysis is described by its practitioners as a stern scientific discipline and by its intractable opponents as a form of magic, comparable to physiognomy, phrenology and mesmerism, though far more dangerous. Dr. Jastrow, who was himself a psychologist of no slight repute, did not adopt either of these positions. He credits Freud with scientific, as distinct from mystical, motives, and even accepts the three cardinal concepts of the psychoanalytic cosmos; namely, the subconscious, the libido, or instinctual urges, and the possibility of sublimation, which is to say of the diversion of these urges into socially useful channels of expression. These concepts comprehend what is called "depth psychology"; and this much of Freudianism, Dr. Jastrow believed, will remain when the great body of psychoanalytic literature shall seem as fantastic and incredible as the writings of the Sixteenth Century cabalists and necromancers. But he rejects the famous Freudian topography of the unconscious with its heartland of the Id, its interpretation of original sin in the dogma of the universal Oedipus complex. He discovers an equally unscientific simplification in the Adlerian myth of the universal inferiority complex, and in the "collective unconscious", posited by Jung, which appears ironically to have influenced both the Nazi doctrine of the Herrenvolk and the doctrine of "racial paranoia" applied by certain anti-Nazi psychiatrists to the whole German people. Similarly, in the matter of therapeutic techniques, he recognizes the value of biographical revelation and of confession and catharsis in the cure of neurosis, but dismisses the rest of the business, and especially the device of "transference", as nonsensical or pernicious.

Unlike most professional critics of psychoanalysis, Dr. Jastrow was well aware of its philosophical implications. He wrote, however, from the standpoint of one who considers psychology a division of biology rather than of philosophy. Thus, with all its virtue his book does not supply what seems most needed at this point; namely, an analysis of the psychoanalytic gospel in terms of its epistemology, cosmology and ontology, and above all its bearing upon our notions of ethics, law and the nature of Society.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED